



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/681,384	10/09/2003	Takashi Kamijo	032009	6397

38834 7590 08/23/2005

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

FINEMAN, LEE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2872

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/681,384

Applicant(s)

KAMIJO ET AL.

Examiner

Lee Fineman

Art Unit

2872

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/15/05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an amendment filed 10 June 2005 in which claims 3, 6, 8 and 13 were amended and claim 14 was added. Claims 1-14 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ito et al., International Patent Publication WO01/55753A.

Regarding claims 1, 13 and 14, Ito et al. disclose an optical film/image display/polarizer (figs. 1-5) comprising a film (fig. 1) having a structure having a minute domain (14) dispersed in a matrix (13) formed of a translucent water-soluble resin including an iodine light absorbing material (page 11, lines 1-13 and page 36, lines 1-15, for translation see US Patent Publication 2003/0137633 page 4, section [0066] and page 21, sections [0146]-[0150]).

Regarding claims 2- 4, Ito et al. further disclose wherein the minute domain is formed of an oriented birefringent material, which is liquid crystalline (and therefore shows liquid crystalline properties), with 0.02 or more of birefringence (page 12, line 26- page 13, line 4 and page 13, lines 21-29, for translation see US Patent Publication 2003/0137633 page 5, sections [0073] and [0078]).

Regarding claim 5, Ito et al. further disclose wherein in a refractive index difference between the birefringent material forming the minute domain and the translucent water-soluble resin in each optical axis direction, a refractive index difference (Δn^1) in direction of axis showing a maximum is 0.3 or more, and a refractive index difference (Δn^2) between the Δn^1 direction and a direction of axes of two direction perpendicular to the Δn^1 direction is 50% less of the Δn^1 (Table 2).

Regarding claim 6, Ito et al. further disclose wherein an absorption axis of the iodine light absorbing material is oriented in a direction of an axis showing a maximum refractive index difference between the birefringent material forming the minute domain and the translucent water-soluble resin (page 12, line 26-page 13 line 10 and page 36, for translation see US Patent Publication 2003/0137633 page 5, sections [0073]-[0074], when n_1 is the same as the refractive index of the optically isotropic continuous phase and page 22, section [0152]).

Regarding claim 7, Ito et al. further disclose wherein the film is manufactured by stretching (page 36, lines 1-15, for translation see US Patent Publication 2003/0137633 page 21, sections [0146]-[0150]).

Regarding claim 8, Ito et al. further disclose wherein the minute domain has a length of 0.05 through 500 μm in a direction perpendicular to the direction of an axis showing a maximum refractive index difference between the birefringent material forming the minute domain and the translucent water-soluble resin (page 13, lines 11-15, for translation see US Patent Publication 2003/0137633 page 5, section [0074-0075]).

Regarding claim 9, Ito et al. further disclose wherein the iodine light absorbing material has an absorbing band at least in a band of 400 through 700 nm wavelength

Art Unit: 2872

range (page 2, line 27-page 3, line 7, for translation see US Patent Publication 2003/0137633 page 1, section [0014]).

Regarding claims 11 and 12, Ito et al. further disclose wherein the polarizer is a polarizing plate (fig. 1) with a transparent protective layer (11) formed at least on one side of the polarizer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito et al.

Ito et al. further disclose wherein a transmittance to a linearly polarized light in a transmission direction is 80% or more, a haze value of 5.3%, and a haze value to a linearly polarized light in an absorption direction is 30% or more (Table 3). Ito et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the haze value in a transmission direction being 5% or less. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the haze value 5% or less, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. One would have been motivated to make the haze value 5% or less for the purpose of providing a clearer image. In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977) See also In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 10 June 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the claimed feature of having a water-soluble resin including an iodine light absorbing material is not suggested or taught by Ito et al. because the continuous phase/discontinuous phase layer (12) does not include iodine only the light scattering layer (24) does. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Ito et al. disclose an optical film polarizer in figs. 1-5 comprising a film (fig. 1) having a structure having a minute domain (14) dispersed in a matrix (13) formed of a translucent water-soluble resin including an iodine light absorbing material at least at the surface thereof. There is no limitation as to where or how in the film the iodine light absorbing material is included. Therefore Ito et al. meets the language as claimed and the rejection is proper.

The applicant similarly argues that because only the light scattering layer (24) is disclosed as being manufactured by stretching and not the continuous phase/discontinuous phase layer (12), Ito et al. is not an appropriate rejection. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated above, there are no specifics included in the claimed language about stretching the film. It is further noted that in section [0070] of Ito et al. it states that the continuous phase/discontinuous phase layer (12) can also be manufactured by stretching.

Applicant also argues that the rejection of claim 6 is inappropriate because the prior art sections detailed in the rejection do not address the continuous phase. The

Art Unit: 2872

examiner respectfully disagrees and directs the applicant to lines 8-11 of section [0074] which detail the interaction of the two phases.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lee Fineman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2313. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew Dunn can be reached on (571) 272-2312. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2872

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



LAF

August 19, 2005



MARK A. ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER